



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The separate independence of communities, and the popular jealousy of that independence is the tocsin of interminable wars. As anarchy among individuals is the savage state of men, so is the independence of tribes and kingdoms the savage state of nations. If the amalgamation of small states into great empires, has secured peace within their own borders, the union of all nations under one head would banish all open war from the earth. Never was there a more senseless or inhuman policy than that which strives to maintain a balance of power between nations; it is the apple of eternal discord. The prevalent dread of universal monarchy is a groundless timidity. Rulers, indeed, are interested in the preservation of their independent power; but to the mass of men no reason can be shown why all the justice and protection they seek from a well-ordered government of their own, cannot be better conferred by one that is universal. Individual liberty is always greater in large than in small communities; and under a government of the world, especially on the federal plan, political restraint would be scarcely felt.

It requires no great political foresight to perceive that the operations of the world are tending to this result, and no great depth of philosophy to prove that it is demanded by the social nature of man. Christianity is preparing the world for it, and the nations, under the millennial reign of Christ, will own no other sovereign. Our country will be the unbounded orb of the earth. Enemies, indeed, there may be, but they will be enemies of the truth simply, and may be found at our sides as well as on a distant continent; while neither differing languages nor intervening oceans will divide hearts sympathizing in piety and love, and the rapid messengers of science will convey the tuitions of Divine truth to the antipodes of the Globe.—*Christian Citizen*, 1847.

---

#### PEACE DEPUTATION TO LORD PALMERSTON.

A numerous deputation from the Peace Congress Committee of London and Manchester had an interview by appointment, with Lord Palmerston, in his private residence, 144, Piccadilly, at twelve o'clock on Friday, to present a memorial praying for the insertion in the treaty negotiating at Paris of a clause binding the contracting Powers to refer to arbitration any subsequent causes of difference.

The following are the names of the members of Parliament and other gentlemen composing the deputation:—

The Right Hon. T. M. Gibson, M.P., Lord Robert Grosvenor, M.P., Mr. Richard Cobden, M.P., Mr. Charles Hindley, M.P. Mr. George Hadfield, M.P., Mr. James Bell, M.P., Mr. Joseph Crook, M.P., Mr. Lawrence Heyworth, M.P., Mr. Frank Crossley, M.P., Mr. Edward Miall, M.P., Mr. J. B. Smith, M.P., Mr. Apsley Pellatt, M.P., Mr. James Kershaw, M.P., Mr. Thomas Barnes, M.P., Mr. Wm. Biggs, M.P., Mr. Wm. Ewart, Mr. James Heywood, M.P., Mr. Philip Price, M.P., Mr. Joseph Sturge, Mr. George Edmunds, and Mr. Alderman Baldwin, of Birmingham; Mr. H. E. Gurney, Lombard street, Mr. J. Gurney Barclay, Lombard street, Mr. George W. Alexander, Lombard street, Mr. E. F. Collins, Hull, Mr. Wm. Rawson, Manchester, Mr. J. B. Cooke and Rev. Francis Bishop, Liverpool, Mr. Robert Charleton, Bristol, Mr. S. White Godalming, Dr. Ellis, Richmond, Mr. F. Ashby, Staines, Mr. Wm. Christy, Kingston, Mr. Isaac Gray Bass, Brighton, Mr. John Everett Euton, Mr. Jesse Gutteridge, Dunstable, Mr.

Thomas Catchpool and Mr. Stephen Unwin, Colchester, Mr. Samuel Lucas, Hitchin, Mr. Henry Ashworth, Bolton, Mr. Charles Gilpin, London, Rev. Dr. Fletcher, London, Mr. John Moreland, Croydon, Mr. Joseph Cooper, Tottenham, Mr. Robert Alsop, Stoke Newington, Mr. Alfred Rosling, Camberwell; Mr. Joseph Barrett, Camberwell, Mr. L. A. Chamerovrow, London, Mr. Edmund Fry, London, Mr. John Jones, London, Dr. Oxley, Hackney, Mr. B. W. Wiffin, Woburn, Rev. Benjamin Williams, Dowlais, Mr. S. Horman, Fisher, London, Rev. Henry Richard, London, Mr. Washington Wilks, London, Mr. Henry Sterry, London, Mr. Alexander Brockway, London.

The deputation was introduced by

Mr. Milner Gibson, with the remark that they did not mean to imply any want of confidence in the wisdom and moderation of the negotiators now engaged at Paris. The committee, from which the memorial proceeds, was appointed at a large meeting held at Manchester, some years since, attended by five or six hundred gentlemen from various parts of the country. There might be differences of opinion among the gentlemen present on what is called the abstract question, of peace and war; but they were all heartily agreed upon the desirableness of substituting arbitration for war, as a practical proposition.

Mr. Richard, the secretary, then read the memorial, which was as follows:—

To the Right Hon. Lord Palmerston, First Lord of the Treasury, and the other members of her Majesty's Government.

The memorial of the London and Manchester Peace Conference Committee, Sheweth:

That your memorialists regard with sincere satisfaction the conferences now sitting at Paris, with a view to negotiate terms of peace, and earnestly pray that a spirit of wisdom and moderation may control the minds of those to whom this momentous mission is confided, so that Europe may be speedily rescued from the distraction and calamities to which it has been recently a prey.

That in the judgment of your memorialists, the experience gained during the present deplorable conflict, proves the unchanged and unchangeable character of war, and has served effectually to dispel any vague illusions that may have been cherished, as though the progress of intelligence and morality could do much to mitigate its inherent horror and brutality. It is found still to be, what it has ever been a scourge of humanity—a reproach to reason—a scandal to religion—an organized barbarism in the heart of civilization. And is it not time that the princes and statesmen of Europe should seriously review the system on which the affairs of the great commonwealth of nations has been hitherto conducted, and to consider whether some means cannot be devised better adapted to avert the recurrence of so disastrous an evil?

Your memorialists cannot but regard it as matter of deep lamentation, that in the relations at present existing between Governments, no adequate provision has ever been attempted for the pacific and honorable adjustment of such disputes as must occasionally arise between states as between individuals. Instead of exercising a wise forethought to anticipate and provide for these critical emergencies, they have been left to the violent passions and hazardous accidents of the moment; while the intervals of peace are employed, not in allaying prejudice and disarming suspicion, but in making enormous preparations for war, which, while they exhaust the resources of states and produce suffering and disaffection among the people, are so far from affording any security against war, that they serve perpetually to foment those feelings of mutual jealousy and alarm in which wars so generally take their rise.

Your memorialists respectfully submit, that at a time when the leading

powers of Europe are assembled, in order to arrange their future relations with each other, an opportunity will be afforded, such as rarely occurs, for devising some means of settling international disputes without having recourse to the sword. The history of the past abundantly proves, that wars most frequently become inevitable among nations, not because the original point of difference is incapable of a pacific solution; but because those differences become inflamed by angry recriminations and the clamorous outcries of popular passion. When all parties to the quarrel have become thus exasperated and compromised, it is no wonder if even a friendly, and still more an armed and threatening mediation, on the part of other powers, should fail to compose the difference. It is believed, however, that this evil may to a great extent be avoided, by recognizing the principle of an umpirage, to which the disputes of state may be referred, *before* the original difficulty has become complicated and aggravated by excited feeling, and by those overt acts of a hostile or menacing nature, from which, it is alleged, the contending parties cannot retreat without loss of honor and dignity.

Your memorialists, therefore, venture most earnestly to urge upon her Majesty's Government the importance of proposing at the conferences now sitting, some system of international arbitration, which may bring the great interests of nations within the cognizance of certain fixed rules of justice and right. And without presuming to indicate the precise form in which the principle of arbitration should be applied, your memorialists would, with great deference, suggest that, at least a provision might be introduced into the treaty of peace, which, they trust, is about to be concluded, binding the respective governments to refer such misunderstandings as may hereafter arise between any of them, on the questions to which the treaty relates, to the decision of an impartial arbitrator, he being mutually chosen—"the high contracting parties" (to employ the language in which such a stipulation is expressed in a recent treaty between Great Britain and the United States,) "solemnly engaging to consider the decision of the arbitrator as absolutely final and conclusive in each case decided upon by him."

Signed on behalf of the committee,

GEORGE WILSON, *Chairman*.  
HENRY RICHARD, *Secretary*.

Lord Robert Grosvenor said, that though he had supported his Lordship's administration in the conduct of the war, and that though there were some expressions in the memorial which had not his concurrence, no one more heartily agreed than himself in the prayer of the memorial. He had taken part, some years since, in the debate in the House of Commons on this subject, and every succeeding year had strengthened the conviction he had then expressed. The very facts of the origin of the present war showed what might have been done had this principle been acted upon. Had the nations interested instructed their representatives at Vienna to decide as well as deliberate upon the points submitted to them, the war might have been averted. He desired now, earnestly to press upon his lordship, that the moment was most favorable for the advocacy of such a proposal. Such a moment might not occur for years. It might be impossible, perhaps, to establish a Congress of Nations for the purpose of deliberating upon the subject; but when the powers of Europe were assembled to make arrangements for its future peace, it would surely be a great misfortune to humanity should the opportunity be lost without the question being mooted. Therefore he hoped that his lordship, wielding at this time so great an influence, would take into his serious consideration the prayer of the memorial.

Lord Palmerston replied, he need not say that the government would give to the memorial the attention due, not only to the spirit in which it was

conceived, but to the parties from whom it emanated. But he could not, in fairness, say that it appeared to him the object at which it pointed was very likely to be attained. No doubt, in the abstract, nothing could be more reasonable than the course proposed, that when nations differed, they should, like individuals, agree to refer their points of difference to some impartial third person. But this system, that was perfectly practicable between individual members of the same community, was not equally applicable to nations, because it was nearly impossible to find arbitrators who might be considered to have no interest in the question at issue. Take the very case adduced, that of the present war. Who was the impartial judge between Turkey and Russia? There had been several instances of late years in which this reference had been attempted, but he would not say that the results were encouraging. One of these was the case of our own dispute with the United States of America, in which the king of the Netherlands had made an award, to which the Americans objected, because in their judgment it was rather a recommendation than a decision. More frequently arbitration had been tried in cases where private individuals claimed compensation from foreign governments—no doubt with success, but still the result was not very encouraging. There was another difficulty: they must stipulate beforehand the court of appeal, or the discussion about the appointment might itself become an element of dissension.

After a few remarks from Mr. Collins, of Hull, Mr. Cobden remarked, that practically our Government had recognized this principle in the treaty not long ago concluded between this country and America. Respecting the fisheries question such a stipulation had been introduced; and at this very moment, we had proposed a reference on the controversy respecting Central America. All they wished was now to take shelter under these precedents. They regarded it as of the highest importance to the interests of humanity, that there should be introduced into the pending treaty a solemn stipulation, that future misunderstandings should be submitted to the decision of a court of appeal, before the disputes had become unmanageable through the excitement of passion.

Lord Palmerston repeated, he wished not to be understood as objecting to the principle of arbitration. He quite agreed that where it could be applied it was the duty and interest of governments to adopt it. It especially applied to those minor matters which did not involve great questions of national right or advantages, but were yet, as had been observed, a frequent cause of war. He was quite sure that whoever might be charged with the government of this country, and he might say of France and of Austria, would be animated by a strong desire not to allow small matters to involve them in a state of war. It should be remembered that we had now enjoyed forty years of peace from 1815 to 1854, and that the progress of civilization must give increased security for the peace of Europe. Associations like those now represented, though he could not go with them to the full extent, must yet have great influence on the general opinion of mankind: and though their particular propositions might not always be the best calculated to accomplish the end in view, he could not deny that they must greatly dispose men to prefer the solid advantages of peace to the more dazzling results of war.—*Morning Star, London.*